

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
**CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL**

Case No. 2:25-cv-00930-AH (JDEx) Date February 28, 2025

Title *Christopher S. Bennett v. Daniel Juarez, et al.*

Present: The Honorable Anne Hwang, United States District Judge

Yolanda Skipper  
Deputy Clerk

Not Reported  
Court Reporter

Attorney(s) Present for Plaintiff(s):  
None Present

Attorney(s) Present for Defendant(s):  
None Present

**Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE DISMISSAL OF  
DEFENDANT PURSUANT TO JUDICIAL IMMUNITY**

After reviewing the Complaint, it appears as though Defendant Daniel Juarez (“Juarez”) may be protected by judicial immunity. *See Forrester v. White*, 484 U.S. 219, 225 (1988) (“judges have long enjoyed a comparatively sweeping form of immunity” for acts that relate to the “judicial process”); *Ashelman v. Pope*, 793 F.2d 1072, 1075 (9th Cir. 1986) (judicial immunity applies “however erroneous the act may have been”); *Mireles v. Waco*, 502 U.S. 9, 11 (1991) (“judicial immunity is not overcome by allegations of bad faith or malice”).

With respect to Juarez, the Complaint alleges that he “is an individual with his address of [*sic*] 111 N. Hill Street[,] Los Angeles, CA 90012.”<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Court judicially notices that this is the address of the Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Superior Court for the County of Los Angeles. *See* Stanley Mosk Courthouse Location, Parking and Business Hours, The Superior Ct. of Cal.: Cnty. of L.A., <https://www.lacourt.org/courthouse/info/la> (last visited February 27, 2025); *Pitts v. Unknown*, 2023 WL 7434973, at \*3 n.3 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 9, 2023) (judicially noticing the Stanley Mosk Courthouse).

Compl. ¶ 6. The Complaint also alleges that “Mr. Juarez . . . usurp[ed] another judicial officer’s order” and “decided on the basis of argumentation and not facts” in his “decision to grant temporary conservatorship.” *Id.* ¶¶ 26–28.

These facts could only be made in reference to a judge at the Stanley Mosk Courthouse. In accordance with the foregoing, Plaintiff is **ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE**, in writing, by March 7, 2025, why the Court should not dismiss with prejudice Plaintiff’s claims against Daniel Juarez as barred by judicial immunity.

No oral argument on this matter will be heard unless otherwise ordered by the Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 78(b); C.D. Cal. R. 7-15. The Order will stand submitted upon the filing of the response to the Order to Show Cause. Failure to respond to the Order to Show Cause will result in the dismissal of this action.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**